UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2588th MEETING: 13 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2588)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia: (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213); (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222); (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2588th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 13 June 1985, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2588)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sinclair, Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and the other members of the delegation took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Mboumoua (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Karran (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Davane (Mozambique),

Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mrs. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received from the representatives of Burkina Faso, Egypt and Madagascar a letter dated 12 June [*S/17264*] which reads as follows:

> "We, the undersigned members of the Security Council, have the honour to request that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Mfanafuthi J. Makatini, head of the International Department and Chief Representative of the African National Congress of South Africa, in connection with the Council's current consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in Namibia'."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council accedes to that request.

It was so decided.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. KURODA (Japan): Mr. President, I should like, first of all, to express my appreciation for this opportunity to participate in the discussion of the question of Namibia, one of the most important long-standing matters ever to come before the United Nations. I should also like to extend to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June, and to commend you on the admirable manner in which you have been guiding the work.

8. The Security Council and General Assembly have adopted a number of resolutions on the question of Namibia. The front-line States, the contact group, the Secretary-General and other parties have been making serious efforts to resolve the issue and many countries, including my own, have applied strong pressure in a variety of areas, on South Africa. Nevertheless, South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia.

9. The independence of Namibia should be achieved by the will of its inhabitants through a free election under the supervision of the United Nations. To this end it is imperative that the parties concerned faithfully implement Council resolution 435 (1978).

10. The international community was encouraged in the summer of 1983 when, following a visit by the Secretary-General, South Africa expressed the view that the technical obstacles to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) had been removed. In early 1984 Pretoria promised to the Government of Angola that it would recall all South African troops which were deployed in Angolan territory. Regrettably, however, South Africa has at the same time been taking measures which block a solution of the problem.

11. First, South Africa has introduced the so-called linkage issue, while assuring the international community of its co-operation in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Japan's position is that the solution of the Namibian question must not be obstructed by any extraneous issues which are incompatible with resolution 435 (1978).

12. Secondly, it was recently revealed that South African military teams had been operating in northern Angola. This revelation has greatly damaged the credibility of the South African Government with regard to its intention to implement the Lusaka Agreement.

13. Thirdly, in defiance of international opinion, South Africa once again decided to set up what it claims to be an interim government in Namibia. But no country will take at face value the Government of South Africa's assurances that this is indeed "an interim mechanism for the internal administration of the Territory pending agreement on an internationally acceptable independence" [*see S/17152, appendix 2*].

14. As my Government has informed the Secretary-General [*S/17207*], Japan regards as null and void any measures taken by the Government of South Africa which are incompatible with resolution 435 (1978).

15. The Secretary-General's report issued last week [*S/17242*] clearly reflects the frustration the international community feels towards what has happened in these one and half years. My Government wholeheartedly supports the conclusions presented in that report.

16. In the light of this course of events, one can only conclude that the international community must for some time to come persevere in applying pressure upon South Africa wherever and however possible.

17. As is well known, Japan does not maintain diplomatic relations with South Africa. It does not engage in military or nuclear co-operation of any kind with South Africa. It prohibits direct investments in South Africa. It has called upon Japanese foreign-exchange banks and their branches abroad to refrain from extending any loans to South Africa. Moreover, Japan takes measures to enforce restrictions on cultural, educational and sports contacts with South African nationals in accordance with various United Nations resolutions. My Government has also brought to the attention of all relevant organizations and corporate executives in Japan the Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[1] Japan will continue to enforce those measures until Namibia gains its independence. In this connection we believe that pressure on South Africa should be applied in a concerted manner with as broad participation of the international community as possible.

18. Dialogue among all parties concerned is still essential to the peaceful solution of the questio.i of Namibia. My Government highly values the diplomatic efforts which various countries have been making and earnestly hopes that they will be intensified in order to overcome the present impasse.

19. Those who are suffering most from this prolonged problem are, of course, the Namibian people under the occupation of South Africa, the Namibian refugees who have been forced out of their native land and the neighbouring countries which are accepting those refugees. Japan has long been extending humanitarian assistance to the Namibian people through funds and programmes administered by the United Nations. Japan will do so as long as the need continues. Moreover, when the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) comes into being Japan will extend various forms of co-operation, and after Namibian independence is achieved Japan will spare no effort in extending bilateral economic and technical co-operation throughout the nation-building period.

20. Finally, I should like to emphasize that, although the end of what has already been a long quest for Namibian independence is regrettably not yet in sight, if the international community continues to work in a spirit of unanimity and co-operation we shall surely reach our common goal. In this context Japan hopes that the current session of the Council will be conducted in a constructive manner and that it will result in a step forward in solving this tragic question of Namibia.

21. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. ZAIN (Malaysia): I should like first of all to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for the courtesy accorded to my delegation in agreeing to our request to participate in these critical meetings on the question of Namibia.

23. My country is deeply committed to the struggle for freedom in Namibia. It is a morally just cause. A free Namibia is also essential for long-term peace and stability in southern Africa. In addition, Malaysia sees in recent years a further dimension to the question of Namibian independence. We see it as a symbol of the efforts of the international community to ensure the primacy of law over naked force and of diplomacy over national assertiveness in a world in which malaise, cynicism, lawlessness and assaults on the fragile structure of internationalism are an ominously rising tide.

24. For those reasons, Malaysia was honoured when it was designated by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, to attend the current meetings of the Council. Unfortunately, because of pressing and unavoidable business, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country is unable to be present here himself, a fact which he regrets. As a result, I now have the distinct privilege of participating in the debate. It gives me particular pleasure to do so when you, Sir, a diplomat of distinction and experience, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a democratic and non-aligned country, with which my own feels close affinity, is presiding over the Council's deliberations.

25. May I also take the liberty, Mr. President, although Malaysia is not a member of the Council, to express my warm admiration at the devoted and exceptionally professional and effective manner in which your immediate predecessor, the representative of Thailand, conducted the affairs of the Council in the month of May.

26. It is a tragic commentary on the United Nations that the question of Namibia has been before it for as long as the Organization itself has existed. The facts are too well known to require repetition in the Council and my remarks, therefore, will focus on two principal questions; first, does the Council believe that South Africa is serious about implementing resolution 435 (1978), which it adopted nearly eight years ago; secondly, if it does not, what does the Council propose to do about it; what does it take for the Council to act?

27. I may add two related questions which the Council should also ponder: how much longer does the Council expect the people of Namibia to wait for their freedom? What does the Council expect the Namibian people, led by the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), which the United Nations itself recognizes as its sole legitimate representative, to do in the meantime?

28. I turn then to the first of my two principal questions: is South Africa serious or simply playing games with resolution 435 (1978), a resolution, it will be recalled, which everyone in the Council has affirmed is the only basis for a peaceful settlement? The record of South Africa, I suggest, gives an entirely clear answer. It is a record of internal repression and regional destabilization with the objective of promoting an internal political settlement to suit its own purposes, namely, continued political control of Namibia, continued exploitation of its rich resources, and continued dominance in southern Africa by force of arms in order to ensure the preservation of its *apartheid* policies. In this exercise, it has exploited the bait of a strategic objective—which is not its own but which has enabled it to align itself to its most steadfast ally and to sabotage the settlement plan adopted in resolution 435 (1978).

29. Do I need to elaborate? Even those who feel an affinity with the South African régime for economic, strategic or emotional reasons must know that its policy in Namibia is one of systematic terror, harassment, intimidation, arbitrary arrest and detention and, yes, torture—which have all been amply documented by impartial observers, including Church organizations. And can anyone be unaware that South Africa, an industrial Power, with powerful friends, has openly embarked on a campaign of destabilization, including invasion and occupation of neighbouring States, commando raids and assassinations, military and logistical support for sabotage and terrorism by dissident groups, direct sabotage attacks and economic pressures?

30. Moreover, the situation in Namibia is unique in several ways. First, with the sole exception of South Africa

itself, every Member State, in conformity with the position taken by the International Court of Justice, regards South Africa's occupation of Namibia as illegal. I might add, parenthetically, that if the finding of the Court had been otherwise, how fervently would South Africa and its friends have proclaimed their adherence to the rule of law. Secondly, despite all the complexities of the situation, often artificially manufactured, there exists a carefully crafted settlement plan which was adopted by resolution 435 (1978). It may also be well to remind ourselves at this stage—or rather to remind the apologists for South Africa—that the South African régime is not democratic, that the South African régime is a dictatorship as far as the 22 million black South Africans, some 85 per cent of its population, are concerned. It is also brutal. It is also racist and, contrary to its claim, it is the very negation of civilized Western values.

31. If I appear to digress, it is because I want to demonstrate that whatever the law, whatever the opportunity for a settlement, it is in the very nature of the South African régime to oppose any settlement which does not preserve its own privileged position in southern Africa. Hence it has raised all manner of obstructions to the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); hence it has resorted to all manner of provocations, of which the so-called interim government is only the latest example, in the hope that the other parties to the settlement plan would themselves abandon it. In the years since 1978, many of these obstructions have been removed by adroit diplomacy on the part of the Secretary-General and some members of the Council, and also—let it be emphasized—by the patience and good will shown by SWAPO and the other front-line States, which have refused to allow themselves to be provoked. But finally, of course, South Africa has raised the so-called linkage issue, a truly astounding demand. Even when that appears to be chipped away, South Africa becomes more rigid, more demanding and more arrogant.

32. I should like, if I may, to spend a little time on this infamous linkage issue. In all the years since this issue was raised—and raised, it bears repeating, well after the settlement plan was negotiated and agreed upon—there has never been any justification, or even any serious attempt at a justification, for raising the issue at all. For clearly there is none. It is simply a naked exercise in raw power. It is not even pretended that the Cuban troops pose a threat to South Africa. To the contrary, it is South Africa which has invaded Angola. Here indeed is the thug which says that its victim should not have the means to protect itself. Here is South Africa, a country which all acknowledge is in illegal occupation of Namibia, which all know has invaded Angola and which, as recently as 21 May, has conducted a mission of economic sabotage deep inside Angola. Here is that country attempting to dictate the terms of a settlement. The truly extraordinary thing is that some are willing to entertain—no, are encouraging and abetting—this outrageous demand. And, if linkage is to be justified, what next? Perhaps it will be alleged that Angola is not sufficiently pluralistic? Or perhaps that Angola is maintaining unacceptably close relations with one country or another? In his statement to the Council on 10 June the representative of the South African régime talked openly of the need for the people of Angola—I repeat Angola—to exercise their right to self-determination. Is it not clear what the next obstacle would be?

33. It must be obvious, therefore, that this so-called linkage is a subterfuge which is only a means to achieve South Africa's own objective, namely, an internal settlement of the question of Namibia on its own terms. The Council—every member of the Council—must therefore make clear what its own objective is. Is it the exercise by the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination? Is it the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola? Is it the continued protection of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa? Is it the emergence of a more ideologically acceptable régime in Namibia and, perhaps, even in Angola?

34. I am aware that the world is a very complicated place and that here in this chamber sit some very sophisticated diplomats. We all understand the realities of power, of national interest and of strategic objectives. We all understand that, often, motives are not undiluted and objectives not unmixed. But the Council must not let sophistication become mere sophistry. If the United Nations stands for anything at all, it must stand for certain principles. The question which all must answer, therefore, is this: Are the rights of the Namibian people, who have suffered so much for so long, merely secondary to some other strategic objective? If so, what value, then, should we place on avowals about freedom, self-determination, equality and human rights?

35. The current meetings are therefore crucial in determining where the Council—ever member of it—stands on this fundamental issue of principle. And, in the face of South Africa's deliberate obstruction, its record of evasion, provocation and subterfuge, what will the Council do? Already, the Council has adopted some 21 resolutions on Namibia. Among other things, the Council has declared that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and that South Africa must withdraw immediately its administration from the Territory [*resolution 264 (1969)*]: that was in 1969. It has condemned the decision of the South African Government to hold elections in Namibia in December 1978 as contravening its earlier resolutions: that was in 1978. It has reiterated its demand that South Africa should co-operate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the implementation of resolutions 385 (1976), 431 (1978) and 435 (1978) and has even warned South Africa that "its failure to do so would compel the Security Council to meet forthwith to initiate appropriate actions under the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof, so as to ensure South Africa's compliance with the aforementioned resolutions" [*resolution 439 (1978)*]. That, again, was in 1978. The Council has condemned South Africa for its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and has rejected South Africa's insistence on linking the independence of Namibia to irrelevant and extraneous issues [*resolution 539 (1983)*]: that was in 1983. And as recently as on 3 May, the President of the Council issued a statement on behalf of the Council declaring that

> "Members of the Council condemn and reject any unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an

internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978) as unacceptable, and declare the establishment of the so-called interim government in Namibia to be null and void" [*see S/17151*].

36. I have taken the time of the Council to review the position it has taken over some 16 years in order to ask: What now? What more can the Council say? Words, after all, must mean something, and the Council, if I may say so, has run out of words. If the Council is merely to reaffirm and reiterate and re-warn, and nothing more, then, with all the respect I have for the Council, the present debate is little more than an exercise in futility. Having stated its position of principle repeatedly, having witnessed the contemptuous and arrogant response of South Africa repeatedly, I ask: What does it take for the Council to act?

37. Developments over the last seven years have served to demonstrate beyond any equivocation that South Africa will not live up to the terms of resolution 435 (1978) unless there are more effective means of pressure. It must also be recalled that the international settlement contained in that resolution was not the product of South African good will because of friendly and gentle persuasion, but rather of a combination of strong diplomatic pressure and the relentless struggle of the brave freedom fighters of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO. Good intentions, pious hopes, even strong words of condemnation will not move South Africa. Will the Council at last send a signal that it means what it says? Will the Council at last take decisive action, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations?

38. If it does not, what does the Council expect SWAPO and the people of Namibia to do? I hope that members of the Council will not resort to the simple expedient of deploring violence, treating victim and aggressor alike, of pious references to the spirit of the Charter, which seeks a peaceful settlement of disputes. We all want peace, but it ill becomes us, sitting here in the comfort of this elegant chamber, to speak to SWAPO and the Namibian people about a peaceful settlement after all the years of suffering and hardship they have endured, after all the good will and patience they have shown, unless we can show that a peaceful solution is indeed possible and that we are prepared to take decisive action to make it possible.

39. Member States reserve to themselves the right of self-defence—an inherent right, as it is called—and, indeed, they exercise that right with or without the sanction of the Council. The struggle of the Namibian people, led by SWAPO, for independence and self-determination is recognized as legitimate by the United Nations itself. Why, then, should SWAPO be denied the right to conduct its struggle by all means possible, unless the Council can show that it has the will and the means to carry out the plan for a peaceful settlement embodied in resolution 435 (1978)? The people of Namibia are denied their most fundamental right to freedom and independence; they are terrorized, brutalized and marginalized, tortured and killed. What does the Council expect them to do unless it can give them real hope? It was a United States President who said that those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable. It is precisely those who make peaceful change impossible in southern Africa who must be held responsible.

40. My delegation has approached this debate in a serious spirit, even, I may say, in a hopeful spirit that the Council will at last go beyond mere words of affirmation and condemnation. The Council, I submit, has gone as far as it can on that road. The question of Namibia, in fact, provides the Council with an opportunity to correct an injustice to the Namibian people, to contribute to lasting peace in southern Africa, and to reverse the ominous trend away from multilateralism which we are at present witnessing. The cause is just. The situation is urgent. A practical settlement plan exists. Success on the part of the Security Council will have global dimensions. My delegation prays that, by deciding now to take decisive action, the Council will embark on that road.

41. Mr. HOGUE (Australia): It is with particular pleasure that Australia welcomes a fellow Commonwealth member to the presidency. You represent, Sir, a people with whom we share a common devotion to freedom, democracy and cricket.

42. I should also like to express our appreciation of the fine job done last month by our friend and neighbour, Thailand, both by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Siddhi Savetsila, and its representative, Mr. Birabhongse Kasemsri.

43. The Autralian delegation believes that it is both timely and appropriate that the Council should meet at this time to discuss the situation in Namibia. Nineteen months have elapsed since the Security Council considered the failure to implement resolution 435 (1978) and adopted resolution 539 (1983). That fact alone would have warranted a meeting to consider further the situation in Namibia.

44. Now, South Africa's decision to install an interim government in Namibia gives the matter added urgency. This decision, which was adopted in the face of universal condemnation by the international community, represents a direct challenge to the United Nations and provides a sombre backdrop to our meetings.

45. Australia remains fully committed to the implementation of the United Nations plan, as adopted in resolution 435 (1978). We remain convinced that the plan represents the only effective means of bringing Namibia peacefully to independence. When it was adopted the plan was accepted by all parties to the dispute, including South Africa; yet it remains unimplemented. The blame for this lies squarely at the feet of the South African Government, which has repeatedly found excuses to prevaricate and to retreat from its commitments.

46. South Africa's record to date has not been such as to inspire confidence in its bona fides. On the one hand, it has signalled willingness to negotiate; on the other, it has pursued policies of regional destabilization, which have caused considerable suffering and hardship to the popula-

tions of the front-line States. It moved close to acceptance of the final arrangements for the putting into place of the plan, only then to link Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. It gave the impression of flexibility in agreeing to participate in the Lusaka negotiations in 1984, yet once again stymied progress because of linkage. It entered into an agreement with Angola for the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola, but now, as outlined by the representative of South Africa in his statement on 10 June [*2583rd meeting*], it arrogates to itself the right to dispatch troops into neighbouring States.

47. The Australian Government's position on all this is quite clear. It rejects linkage as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and deplores South Africa's recent raid into northern Angola.

48. In 1978, following the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), South Africa established a so-called multi-party conference administration in Namibia. That body was the subject of universal condemnation internationally and of rejection by the Namibian people. Having been rebuffed once, South Africa has clearly not learned its lesson, but is now proceeding to establish another empty shell.

49. Australia's view on this is also quite clear, and was put by the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hayden, on 22 April 1985, when he categorically rejected any attempt to establish an internal administration. Mr. Hayden reiterated the Australian Government's belief that any unilateral moves to transfer power in Namibia that were not in accordance with resolution 435 (1978) would be null and void. He expressed the Government's serious concern at the South African Government's determination to proceed with the establishment of an interim government.

50. My delegation welcomed the fact that the Council, through its President, was able on 3 May 1985 [*S/17151*] to express its condemnation and rejection of unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978) and to declare that the so-called interim government in Namibia was null and void.

51. We should also like to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his intercession with the South African Government in an attempt to dissuade South Africa from proceeding with any actions which could contravene resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978).

52. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for his report [*S/17242*] and for his dedicated commitment to the implementation of the United Nations plan.

53. My delegation has listened with considerable interest to the statements made thus far in the debate. As a member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, we also participated in the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings held at Vienna from 3 June to 7 June. We are fully conscious of the depth of feeling within the international community over South Africa's policies. There may be differences of approach, but there is basic agreement on fundamentals.

54. The Council and the international community at large are agreed on their commitment to Security Council resolution 435 (1978); they condemn unilateral action by South Africa leading towards an internal settlement outside resolution 435 (1978); and they urge South Africa to live up to its professions of adherence to the United Nations plan and to take the necessary steps for its implementation at the earliest possible time.

55. I think we would also all agree that, if South Africa continues to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the Council should meet again to consider the adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations.

56. Given all the things which unite the whole international community, we must ensure that the South African Government is given no reason to mistake differences of emphasis for disagreements about South Africa's policies and actions. We must all send a clear, strong, unified and unambiguous message to the South African Government that the international community demands the early independence of Namibia in accordance with resolution 435 (1978).

57. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Allow me first, Sir, to welcome you to the presidency. The Council has in you an experienced leader and a highly qualified diplomat.

58. I should also like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for their able guidance of the Council's work last month.

59. The resumed discussion in the Council of the question of the speedy elimination of colonialism and racism in Namibia is taking place at a time when the United Nations is commemorating events of great moment: the fortieth anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism at the end of the Second World War—to the attainment of which the Soviet Union made a decisive contribution—the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the Day of Liberation of Africa.

60. Almost two decades ago the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia [*General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966*] and called for the unconditional granting of independence to the people of that country. However, the problem of Namibia is still before the United Nations as the most acute problem in the elimination of colonialism in Africa.

61. It is no mere chance that the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to resume its consideration of the question of Namibia and to give effect to its own resolutions in this regard, in particular its resolution 435 (1978). The same request was made by the Group of African States.

62. High-ranking representatives of many non-aligned countries have come to participate in the work of the Council. Speaking in the Council, the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and ministers for foreign affairs of African States have very graphically spoken of the resolve of the people of Namibia and other peoples of Africa to attain complete liberation and genuine independence for Namibia. There can be no doubt that that goal will be attained, whatever obstacles are placed in the way by the colonialists of Pretoria and those that support them.

63. Almost seven years have passed since the Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), setting forth a plan for the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence.

64. The report submitted to the Security Council by the Secretary-General quite rightly states that South Africa's position continues to make it impossible to start implementing the United Nations plan [*S/17242, para. 45*]. Furthermore, as a result of the recent decision by South Africa to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia, the existing difficulties have been compounded further and acquired a new character.

65. It would be naive to assume that South Africa has been able alone to sabotage, for many decades now, the process of decolonization in Namibia and to resist the will and the demands of the entire international community and conduct itself so aggressively, cynically and defiantly against the African countries, the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. Pretoria could not continue that policy a single day if it did not rely on support from its Western protectors, primarily the United States.

66. The recent bandit-like raid by the South Africans against Angola in the Cabinda region again very graphically highlighted the aggressive, adventuristic nature of the actions of the Pretoria régime against its African neighbours.

67. It is precisely the United States—and South Africa along with it—that in violation of the clear decisions of the Council continues to persist in establishing linkage between Namibia independence and the question of the withdrawal of the Cuban internationalists from Angola. Almost all speakers in the Council have indicated the complete inconsistency, untenability and falsity of this linkage.

68. But, as is clear from the statement by the Secretary of State of the United States of 16 April of this year, the United States Administration continues to predicate the granting of independence to Namibia on the withdrawal of Cuban internationalists from Angola. That is, it is still blocking implementation of United Nations decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia. This obstructionist position of the United States was reaffirmed yesterday in the statement of the United States representative in the Council.

69. This notorious linkage is simply a plot by the Pretoria racists and the United States aimed at not merely creating additional obstructions to implementation of resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia but also dealing a blow to Angola to hamper its sovereign rights, including the right to self-defence embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. The ultimate goal of this sinister plot by the colonialists and racists and of this unsavoury policy is to eliminate the independence of Angola and, together with South Africa, to impose neo-colonialist decisions on Namibia and the whole of southern Africa.

70. In an attempt to concoct from puppet parties a so-called interim government, Pretoria is trying to sabotage United Nations decisions and to hold up for decades the granting of independence to Namibia to prevent the transition of power in that country to SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

71. Those are the real facts of the policies of South Africa and the United States in Namibia and in southern Africa. The hypocritical assurances of Washington regarding its so-called disagreement with Pretoria's plans to create an interim government is quite simply a smoke-screen. In fact the United States and its Western allies continue to hamper the adoption by the Council of comprehensive, binding sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter and continue to expand their ties with the racist régime of that country in very different spheres—political, economic, financial and military. Of particular danger is the extension of assistance to the South African racists by certain NATO [*North Atlantic Treaty Organization*] countries and Israel in creating and developing South Africa's nuclear capability.

72. The international community is quite rightly calling on the Western countries to halt their policy of placating the racist South African régime. It is the duty of the United Nations to bend every effort to put an end to the latest manoeuvres by the United States and racist South Africa to further hamper Namibia's attainment of genuine independence. The entire process of the Namibian settlement should be under the permanent and effective control of the Council.

73. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of Namibia is one of principle, and is consistent. We have stated it many times. The Soviet Union decisively condemns the racist Pretoria régime's new actions to sabotage the Namibian settlement and its measures to implant a puppet régime in Namibia to subvert the basis for a political settlement established in the appropriate United Nations decisions, primarily those of the Security Council.

74. The message from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the peoples, parliaments and Governments of all countries on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War states: "Together with all peoples, the Soviet people decisively calls for the granting of independence to Namibia and the elimination of racism from South Africa."

75. The Soviet Union expresses solidarity with the decisions adopted on the question of Namibia at the Extraodi-

nary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in April. It also supports the decisions taken at the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia held at Vienna in June and at the extraordinary session of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, held at Tunis in May.

76. Our delegation fully shares the view of previous speakers and African and other non-aligned countries concerning the actions of the racist Pretoria régime against Namibia and southern Africa as a whole in imposing colonial slavery by means of ongoing massive repression against the long-suffering Namibian people. South Africa's constant acts of aggression against independent African States create a serious threat to international peace and security.

77. We wish to emphasize however the allegation that the problem of Namibia is only an example of East-West confrontation and is simply a propaganda ploy designed to cover up a fact clear to everyone: that this is an acute conflict between colonialism and the national liberation movement of southern Africa, between the sinister alliance of the Pretoria racists, the United States and other Western countries on the one hand and the people of Namibia and independent countries of Africa on the other.

78. We fully support the appeal of the non-aligned countries that the Council adopt immediate effective measures against the racist régime of South Africa as provided under the Charter, including the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII, to ensure that Pretoria implements the Council's resolutions regarding the immediate granting of genuine independence to Namibia.

79. The Soviet Union supports the early attainment by the Namibian people of its inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence on the basis of maintaining the unity and territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, the immediate and complete withdrawal from Namibia of South African troops and administration and the transfer of all powers to the people of Namibia as represented by SWAPO, recognized as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people.

80. The Soviet Union decisively condemns the continuing plundering of the natural resources of Namibia by the transnational corporations of Western States and views that illegal exploitation of Namibia's resources as a gross violation of the Charter and the decisions of the relevant United Nations bodies.

81. We support the proposals of the African countries that the Security Council should adopt further sanctions against South Africa, including an embargo on the delivery of petroleum and petroleum products to the racist régime of South Africa. Complying with the recommendations of the General Assembly and the decisions of the Security Council, the Soviet Union has no relations with the racist régime of South Africa, nor does it have any contractual agreements with it. Soviet organizations and authorities comply strictly with the resolutions of the Security Council in the matter of the arms embargo against South Africa.

82. My country has given and will continue to give every support to the just struggle the people of Namibia, under the leadership of its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, is waging by every means at its disposal for its liberation.

83. We also feel solidarity with the front-line States that are opposing the neo-colonialist designs of the racists and imperialists. We support the appeal that the international community give support and assistance to the front-line States in their defence of their sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of the constant acts of aggression, oppression and threat on the part of South Africa, whereby it is trying to intimidate the peoples of those countries and force them to cease assisting the national liberation movement in southern Africa.

84. To quote a recent statement by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev:

> "The Soviet Union has always supported the struggle of peoples for liberation from colonial oppression. Today once again our sympathies are with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that are seeking to strengthen their independence and social regeneration. They are our friends and partners in the struggle for stable peace and for just relations among peoples."

85. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): It is indeed a tribute to the Council and a recognition of the importance of the question before us that you yourself, Sir, have chosen to preside over our deliberations on Namibia. We are confident that this will ensure the successful outcome of the debate.

86. I would avail myself of this opportunity also to express our admiration for the extremely efficient and skilful way in which last month the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand handled the Council's affairs.

87. We have listened with great attention to the present debate on Namibia. We fully understand and share the deep frustrations which have permeated the interventions.

88. Few issues have been on the agenda of the United Nations as long as the question of Namibia. In 1969 the Security Council recognized that the General Assembly had terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility over the Territory until its independence [*resolution 264 (1969)*]. Considerable efforts have since been made to secure the exercise by the Namibian people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

89. The adoption by the Council of resolution 435 (1978) added new impetus to the endeavours to reach an internationally acceptable solution. The Secretary-General, whose

tireless efforts we have always held in high esteem, the front-line States and the contact group of the Western five made invaluable contributions during the subsequent negotiations.

90. At an early stage SWAPO—whose President we are glad to see in our midst—committed itself to Namibian independence through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). South Africa's acceptance came late but eventually emerged. Yet South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia in flagrant defiance of the resolutions of the Council.

91. The process of consultations and negotiations aimed at Namibia's independence in an internationally acceptable way has been long and arduous. Repeatedly the international community has been led to believe that the objective was just around the corner. However, time and again optimism quickly faded and gave way to renewed scepticism.

92. A close look at the record leaves little doubt that, each and every time, the responsibility could be placed with South Africa. Whenever momentum seemed to be gaining, South Africa raised new issues and objections. Thus, South Africa has consistently frustrated the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). the word "deception" comes all too easily to mind in this connection.

93. In his report of 29 August 1983 [*S/15943*] to the Council, the Secretary-General concluded that all outstanding issues were virtually resolved and that we had never before been so close to finality on the modalities of implementing resolution 435 (1978). However, the report also confirmed unequivocally that South Africa had once more raised new obstacles, this time linking final acceptance of the implementation of the United Nations plan to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

94. In December 1983 South Africa undertook to begin disengagement of its forces in Angola on 31 January 1984. The completion of the withdrawal was not announced until April this year, but at least the announcement raised hopes that South Africa had finally decided to stop its military destabilization of Angola. Once more the optimism proved unfounded.

95. A month later South African soldiers were apprehended in the northern part of Angola. A prisoner—captain in South Africa's Special Forces—at a press conference held at Luanda on 28 May openly admitted that he had participated in a commando raid directed against American oil installations in Cabinda.

96. The South African Government made no attempt to excuse this renewed, blatant and arrogant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity, an operation which by no stretch of the imagination could be viewed in the context of bona fide efforts towards Namibian independence. On top of that, a few days later the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa suddenly expressed doubt about the possibility of reaching agreement in the negotiations on the question of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

97. Finally, while being engaged in negotiations aimed at creating conditions for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, the South African Government recently consented to further steps to prepare an internal settlement in the Territory.

98. Thus the international community has once more been witnessing what appears to be a consistent pattern of action by the South African Government which cannot but raise the most serious and rapidly increasing doubt about its real intentions.

99. Actually it became clear from the statement made by the South African representative in this debate [*2583rd meeting*] that, while professing adherence to resolution 435 (1978), and allegedly out of concern for the Namibian people, South Africa continues to prepare for what it believes could be another form of internationally acceptable settlement in case Cuban troop withdrawal is not forthcoming.

100. Over the years Denmark has unequivocally expressed the conviction that the people of Namibia must, without delay, be given the opportunity to decide upon their own future through free and fair elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations in conformity with resolution 435 (1978). Denmark has offered to participate in UNTAG and supports the efforts to prepare Namibians for independence by contributing to, among others, the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

101. We have maintained that the settlement of extraneous issues cannot be a precondition for the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, and Denmark will never accept attempts to circumvent the plan by any kind of internal settlement in Namibia. The statement by the President on behalf of the Council on 3 May this year [*S/17151*] bears witness to the fact that this position is shared by all Council members, without exception.

102. Not least in the light of recent developments it is in our view of paramount importance that the Council once more reaffirms its direct responsibility for Namibia and its obligation to secure the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

103. We should also like the Council to warn the South African Government against harbouring any illusions as to the possibility of finding any other solution to the Namibian question which will command international support than the one contained in resolution 435 (1978). The Council must condemn and reject an interim administration in Namibia and declare its establishment to be null and void.

104. Furthermore, the Council should send a clear and unanimous signal to South Africa that it intends to consider adoption of appropriate measures under the Charter of the United Nations if South Africa continues to obstruct the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

105. To avoid any misinterpretation on the part of South Africa as to the resolve of the international community to see this longstanding issue brought to its fruitful conclusion it is important that the Council act in unanimity. This takes not only flexibility but also courage and foresight on the part of its members. The credibility and prestige of the Council are at stake; what is more, the patience of the Namibian people as well as the world community as a whole is running out.

106. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Canada, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

107. Mr. LEWIS (Canada): Mr. President, let me begin as all others have begun by acknowledging the adroit and skilful way in which you handled the affairs of the Security Council and acknowledge as well as all others have done the similar role of your predecessor last month.

108. I should like to thank you and the Council for the opportunity to participate in your deliberations today. As a member of the contact group, Canada has been intimately involved in the plans for Namibia's independence. We therefore wish profoundly that the United Nations efforts to end the conflict and to replace the illegal régime should soon succeed. On that central point, there is no room for doubt: our commitment to achieving independence for Namibia under United Nations auspices is sacrosanct.

109. Recent events in Namibia and Angola, however, give cause for disillusion verging on despair. We have been discussing the same plan for Namibian independence for the better part of a decade. That is frustrating for all of us—for all members of the Council—but any level of frustration which we may endure is as nothing when compared to the plight of the Namibian people and the continued denial of justice which they experience. Such denial is all the more reprehensible when it defies both international law and the international community. Yet, as if such contemptuous intransigence were not enough, we are now informed that there is to be another interim government in Namibia. Other than wilful provocation, what purpose does that serve?

110. Canada, as others, has already stated its rejection of the so-called interim government which is, we understand, to be inaugurated in the coming days. On 19 April last, Mr. Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, made our position clear:

> "We regard unilateral measures taken by the South African Government in relation to the establishment of constitutional bodies and the transfer of power in Namibia to be null and void. Arrangements that may be established as a result of such measures cannot have any status whatsoever under the United Nations settlement plan."

111. As the Secretary-General notes in his report, Canada strongly supported the position he took on this matter [*S/17242, para. 37*]. the evasive and dissembling response given by the Government of South Africa was entirely inconsistent with the proposal which the five Western Governments submitted to the Council on 10 April 1978 [*S/12636*]. So, seven years later, we are faced yet again with measures which are unacceptable to the international community, which challenge the United Nations plan, and which cannot conceivably succeed.

112. But that is only the half of it. While those steps are being taken in Namibia, we receive word that South Africa is withdrawing its forces from Angola, a step which we and this Council have long called for, a step we would warmly welcome, as we would welcome a total South African disengagement from Angola. However, the appearance was masked in duplicity. We now have sad and vivid evidence that South Africa still seeks what it will never achieve, namely, the reshaping of the region unilaterally, through the use of force and without regard for the sovereignty and independence of neighbouring States.

113. South Africa pleads as an excuse the need for security. How can anyone give credence to that? The world knows that the challenge to the South African State does not stem from the situation outside its borders. The seeds of change are sown within.

114. These are all depressing developments because they offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is close to accepting its neighbours as they are and living in peace with them. Worse, the developments offer scant reason to believe that South Africa is ready to co-operate with us in bringing Namibia to independence through free and fair elections under United Nations supervision.

115. We are virtually back to square one. That is where we started this debate seven years ago. This continuing impasse for almost a decade is a great tragedy. A peaceful and internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia would be a huge step for Namibians. It would, on the other hand, have no catastrophic effects on South Africa—quite the contrary. South African lives would no longer be lost for no good reason in Namibia and Angola, and the squandered expenses of that protracted and illegitimate conflict would be saved. The sun would still rise and fall on the Orange River. There might even be a smattering of peace in the region.

116. In the circumstances it is difficult to see why there has been so much hesitation and delay. Even now, were South Africa to comply, the decision would be welcomed throughout the world.

117. The Secretary-General in his report [*S/17242*]—and particularly in paragraph 31—recounts steps that other Governments have taken to meet South Africa's professed concerns. Yet South Africa continues to lay down a condition—the condition of so-called linkage—which has no warrant in international law, which is incompatible with resolution 435 (1978) and which has been rejected by the Council. Perhaps worst of all, that condition, by any objective analysis, is totally unnecessary, is a deliberate obstacle and is the cause of grievous delay.

118. We know from the Secretary-General's report that talks have been held and assurances given which go beyond

anything required by international law. To hold Namibia hostage to what this Council has previously described as "irrelevant and extraneous issues" is palpably outrageous.

119. On 26 October 1983, the representative of Canada was equally unequivocal. He said before the Council:

> "The Secretary-General has noted that South Africa continues to make the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola a condition for its withdrawal from Namibia. South Africa cannot . . . legitimize its illegal occupation of Namibia by raising other issues. . . . Namibia should have its independence regardless of what happens or what does not happen in Angola." [*2488th meeting, para. 83.*]

As they say, *plus ça change* . . .

120. One must not forget the negotiations on Namibia itself. It is worthy recalling just how broad and complete are the agreements which have been reached on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

121. In 1982, after intensive consultations among the parties, involving both the front-line States and the contact group, the participants were able to report to the Secretary-General that agreement had been reached on virtually all of the outstanding issues which had apparently stood in the way of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The parties accepted a set of principles concerning the constituent assembly and the constitution for an independent Namibia. And all will recall that understandings were reached on the question of impartiality and on the size, composition and deployment of UNTAG.

122. The Secretary-General himself then resolved certain points still outstanding during his visit to the region in 1983. South Africa gave assurances that the choice of electoral system, whether proportional representation or constituency-based, would be made and communicated at an early stage.

123. So what remains? South Africa's concerns regarding the transition process having been accommodated, we should now, in theory, look to resolution 435 (1978) not as an obstacle to be overcome but as an opportunity to be seized. In theory, South Africa, SWAPO and the internal parties, as well as the contact group and the front-line States, should now be joining hands to bring Namibia to independence through the United Nations plan. But the theory, alas, is shredded by the practice. All the requisite understandings are in place, but nothing happens. When is resolution 435 (1978) to be applied?

124. Some have implied that part of the responsibility for the current impasse lies at the feet of the contact group. That suggestion is unwarranted. The members of the Council know full well that Canada's reason—and all reasons, I am sure—for belonging to the contact group has been to facilitate Namibia's independence in accordance with the United Nations plan. That is the way it began; that is the basis on which some excellent work was done.

125. That does not mean, however, that we are blind to the delays of the past two years; we are not. The contact group, with the best will in the world, has not succeeded, any more than have others, in bringing independence to Namibia. It is necessary to admit that openly and with candour. Nonetheless, the contact group should not disband, because it still has a role to play one day under resolution 435 (1978).

126. Having said that, Canada admits that it is very difficult to know how to proceed. We shall have to look to other steps that Member States might take, steps which demonstrate that patience is long gone and that the time to move strongly is now.

127. We should perhaps consider reaffirming and reendorsing the voluntary measures as set out in Council resolution 283 (1970). Member States may wish to examine what they have done to conform with its provisions. The provisions were strong. Such measures merit further response as we await the setting of a date for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

128. We will, of course, want to confirm again our readiness to lend assistance, both human and financial, to an independent Namibia. Perhaps the Council will want to address that point.

129. Above all, we should encourage yet again the vigorous participation of the Secretary-General in seeking cooperation from South Africa to establish a timetable for independence. As the representative of Denmark just said, the future of Namibia is a fundamental issue for the United Nations. Its right to independence derives from the very principles on which the United Nations was founded. The Secretary-General has shown himself to be—on this as on all matters—indefatigable. Let the Council renew the mandate previously entrusted to him, with the added sense that he pursue the attainment of resolution 435 (1978) in an unrelenting fashion. And let us call upon South Africa, with quintessential clarity, to live up to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

130. Those are just some of the considerations which make this debate so important. Our options are narrowing. I have already indicated, as has everyone else, that there is no basis for delay and that further delay serves no one's interest. Yet unconscionable delay is precisely what we are faced with, and that is why Canada and others will have to consider our range of choices carefully.

131. On several occasions in this debate speakers have referred to the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. That leads me to one final observation. I think everyone agrees that nothing would so serve the reputation of the United Nations as a significant breakthrough on some significant aspect of peace and security. It could, with dramatic impact, turn public perceptions around. The independence of Namibia is the logical focus. It is the issue on which there is virtual international unanimity. Just as the system of *apartheid* has only one defender, so freedom for Namibia has only one obstacle. The prevarications of the

last seven years, the contempt for United Nations resolutions, the perpetual state of strife, the introduction of yet another illegal interim government, the recent revelations in Angola and, above all, the prolonged suffering and oppression of the Namibian people, must surely win from the Council a resolution on which we can all agree and which will lead to that elusive breakthrough. The timing could not be better. There is a rising crescendo of impatience with South Africa throughout the world, mirrored in the statements at the Council, signalled—as in Canada and other countries—by reviews of Government policy and reflected most recently by the votes in the Congress of the United States.

132. The Council is thus presented with an opportunity to demonstrate that the nations of the world stand united in condemning the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and stand united in urging South Africa to proceed immediately with implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We hope that the resolution which the Council adopts will reinforce such a consensus. It will then represent the most unmistakable, uncompromising and unambiguous message delivered to date.

133. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

134. M. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express to you, and through you to the other members of the Council, our thanks for giving my delegation this opportunity to speak on what is considered to be one of the most important world issues—the heinous racist régime which, in co-operation with a handful of Western States, first and foremost the United States of America, attempts to hamper the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

135. I take this opportunity to convey to you the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. I am fully confident that your political skill and diplomatic know-how will guide the Council, under your leadership, to the desired results.

136. On this occasion I cannot but express to your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, our admiration for the ideal and calm way in which they conducted the business of the Security Council during the very busy month of May.

137. The Council is now meeting, following urgent requests in letters from the President of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Chairman of the Group of African States to consider the situation in Namibia and the implementation of its resolutions in this context, particularly resolution 435 (1978). That, indeed, was the subject of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, with a view to undertaking an evaluation of the situation in Namibia and other elevant issues and to consider ways and means for the non-aligned countries to continue to intensify their solidarity with the heroic struggle for independence of the people of Namibia and assistance to that people, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative.

138. Resolution 435 (1978)—which was adopted by the Council unanimously and which is considered an expression of the will of the international community on the need to put an end to the *apartheid* régime and to achieve genuine independence for Namibia—contains the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. This plan has encountered many setbacks. Many obstacles have been placed in the way of its implementation and indications are that the heinous *apartheid* régime is totally unwilling to heed the decisions of the international community on the independence of Namibia.

139. That régime would not have been able to defy the will of the international community, embodied in Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, without the comprehensive assistance provided by its Western allies, in particular the United States of America. It continues to reinforce its heinous policy of *apartheid* and its illegal control over Namibia, thus defying the resolutions of the international Organization. The policy of repression, oppression and terrorism is characteristic of this régime, and the killing of innocent women and children has become a daily practice. The violation of human rights in Namibia has become its first priority. There is no reason for hope; rather, the racist régime and the white minority are persisting in their intransigence, thus flouting the resolutions and decisions of the international community and thwarting the aspirations of the peoples of the world to see an end to the policy of hegemony practised by the régime in South Africa.

140. There is every indication that the white minority régime has no intention of implementing the United Nations plan. This can be clearly seen in the latest manoeuvres of the leaders of that régime to achieve a sham independence for Namibia by installing a puppet régime through the establishment of a so-called internal administration to which powers are to be transferred. Indeed, this would be tantamount to installing a puppet government to serve the interests of South Africa.

141. We also strongly condemn the fragmentation of the national unity of the Namibian people, undertaken by the racist régime through drafting Namibians in its armed forces. We further condemn its use of mercenary bands to perpetuate its illegal occupation of the Territory. The massing of military forces and the acts of aggression perpetrated by the South African régime against the neighbouring African States pose a serious threat to the security of these independent States, as well as peace in the entire area.

142. The policy of exploitation and plunder of Namibia's natural resources as practised by the Pretoria régime, in co-operation with its Western allies, with the United States at the forefront and their transnational corporations, is a violation of the relevant United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

143. However the régime in South Africa and its armed forces escalate their acts of oppression and terrorism against the people of Namibia, Pretoria will never be able to subjugate the daily resistance of the heroic people of Namibia, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative, in its valiant struggle against the racist minority régime. The day is not far off when Namibia will be fully independent and the Namibian people master of their own soil.

144. There are indications that the time has not yet come for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Tremendous obstacles preventing implementation are being erected by the régime of South Africa, in co-operation with the United States. South Africa and the United States link the independence of Namibia to purely extraneous issues. The presence of Cuban forces in Angola has no relationship whatsoever to the independence of Namibia. That presence was requested by the legitimate authorities in Angola, on the basis of full agreement between two independent States. Such linkage has been categorically rejected. It may result in delaying the independence of Namibia and ultimately undermine the achievement of independence, thus maintaining the Territory under the hegemony of the white minority régime. Its natural resources would remain under colonial pillage and exploitation, in contravention of the United Nations plan. Such linkage is a flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of an independent country-member of this Organization.

145. The further report of the Secretary-General of 6 June is perfectly clear, particularly in its concluding remarks [*S/17242, paras. 45-48*]. In those paragraphs the Secretary-General notes that it has not proved possible to finalize arrangements for the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia, owing to the obstacles and preconditions imposed by the racist régime in South Africa. I take this opportunity to convey to the Secretary-General my delegation's appreciation for his efforts to bring about the implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia, in particular Council resolution 435 (1978).

146. South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, its large-scale militarization of that Territory, and its use of Namibia as a springboard for acts of aggression and sabotage against neighbouring independent States—all pose a major threat to peace and security. My delegation, therefore, believes that in keeping with the legal responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia until that Territory achieves independence, the Council must take urgent steps to assure genuine, unconditional respect on the part of the racist régime for Council resolutions, in particular resolution 435 (1978), in order to enable the people of Namibia to exercise its inalienable rights to self-determination and independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole legitimate representative. Those steps must include the imposition of sanctions, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Until that is done, it would be useful for the Council to reiterate its resolutions 418 (1977), 421 (1977) and 558 (1984) with regard to strict respect for the binding arms embargo imposed on South Africa and to a strict prohibition on weapons imports from South Africa.

147. In our view, South Africa's stubbornness and its continuing failure to implement United Nations resolutions, in particular Council resolution 435 (1978), can have no explanation other than the encouragement of the United States. The policy of so-called constructive engagement with South Africa pursued by the United States Administration is aimed basically at encouraging the racist régime to continue rejecting the resolutions of the international community and at stiffening the determination of that régime to persist in its aggressive policies and its threats against neighbouring independent States. Providing the régime with various types of weapons and co-operating with it in all fields, including the nuclear field—which is precisely what the United States Administration is doing—are intended to bring about the failure of the United Nations plan.

148. The increased co-operation between certain Western States, including the United States, and the racist régime of Pretoria does indeed hamper Namibia's attainment of independence. South Africa can be made to toe the line only by putting an end to all types of co-operation with that régime. Continued co-operation with the South African régime runs counter to the will of the international community and to United Nations resolutions. We have only to note which States are co-operating with the South African régime to see clearly which States encourage the continued occupation of Namibia.

149. In its report,[2] the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Administering Authority of the Territory, shows clearly that it is the United States, other Western States and Israel that engage in co-operation with the Pretoria régime. This report shows that South Africa has provided Israel with uranium and has collaborated with Israel in extraction and refinement of that element, and states that Israel may be acting as the agent of the United States in weapons sales to South Africa. The United States has indeed granted permission to the Israeli Government to export military equipment to South Africa.

150. The Syrian Arab Republic reaffirms its support for the Final Document [*S/17184, annex*] adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, particularly its paragraphs 36 and 37. In this connection, we wish to reiterate our firm denunciation of the continuing co-operation by some Western States and Israel with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear, military, economic and political fields. We are convinced that such co-operation undermines international solidarity against the *apartheid* régime and helps perpetuate the illegitimate, illegal occupation of Namibia by that régime.

151. The Syrian Arab Republic also condemns the increasing co-operation between the two racist régimes, in Tel Aviv and Pretoria. In that context, we note the similarity between the aggressive designs of the two régimes, including their iron-fist policies and their employment of hot pursuit, against the peoples of South Africa, Namibia, Palestine, southern Lebanon, and all the Arab territories occupied by Israel. Moreover, we condemn the decision of the two régimes to continue and increase their co-operation in the military, economic political and nuclear fields, for such

co-operation poses a threat to international peace and security.

152. The Syrian Arab Republic calls on the United States Administration and on the States members of the European Community to reconsider the trade concessions granted through free-trade agreements with Israel and to consider their abrogation. Those concessions and agreements help in selling South African products in United States and European Community markets.

153. In conclusion, the Syrian Arab Republic declares its total solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Namibian people against the white minority régime and for freedom, independence and the full exercise of its inalienable right to self-determination. We stress our full support for SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We support the legitimacy of its struggle by all available means, including armed struggle, against South Africa's occupation of Namibia. We stress our complete solidarity with the front-line States in responding to the acts of aggression of the racist régime. We call on the Council to shoulder its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to take the measures necessary to force South Africa to bend to the will of the international community, including the imposition of sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

154. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

155. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria): Mr. President, I should like first to express to you and to the other members of the Council my gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the discussion of this question. I should also like to congratulate you most cordially upon your election as President for the current month. In view of your widely acknowledged abilities as a prominent and distinguished statesman and diplomat, we are convinced that the Council will successfully carry out its high responsibilities.

156. I also take this opportunity, Sir, to express my gratitude to your predecessor, Mr. Kasemsri, the representative of Thailand, for his competent guidance of the Council during the month of May.

157. The People's Republic of Bulgaria welcomes the convening of the Council to consider the situation in Namibia, at the request of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of African States. Bulgaria fully shares the serious concern of the international community over the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist Pretoria régime and the extension of the inhumane *apartheid* system to it. The Territory, where considerable military power is concentrated, is ever more frequently used as a military base and a springboard for launching so-called reprisal actions against neighbouring independent African States, actions which have gravely destabilized the situation in the region. South Africa continues to occupy part of Angola. All in all, an explosive situation has been created which is fraught with grave danger for peace and security in Africa and in the whole world.

158. There is no doubt that the question of Namibia, which has been on the agenda of the United Nations for 40 years, is one of the most flagrant examples of brutal colonial domination and predatory exploitation of human and natural resources belonging to another people.

159. The concern of the Member States stems primarily from the fact that—despite the existing universal consensus on the principles and means of solving the Namibian problem, formulated, above all, in Council resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) as well as in other important United Nations documents—the successful and just settlement of this urgent problem continues to be blocked by the South African régime.

160. In this connection, we fully share the general recognition that South Africa would not have ignored so cynically these decisions had it not relied on the political, military, economic and financial support of certain Western States, particular the United States and Israel. That support is of crucial importance for strengthening the strategic potential and the military capability of the racist régime.

161. In a news report of 6 June this year, *The New York Times* informed us that nearly 300 United States companies operated in South Africa and that American investments in that country had reached $15 billion, while those firms controlled almost 50 per cent of South African petrochemicals, 70 per cent of computer production and 30 per cent of the auto industry.

162. The South African racists and the transnational corporations continue to exploit extensively the natural resources of Namibia, thus making enormous profits. There is no doubt about the shared interest of Pretoria and other outside circles in the suppression of the national liberation movement, in the colonial plunder of the peoples in that part of the world and in the consolidation of their common imperialist positions.

163. It is this shared interest that is at the foundation of the policy of constructive engagement towards South Africa, which in practice is tantamount to propping up the aggressive régime. It is also at the heart of the concurrence of the schemes of the South African racists with the strategic plans of the imperialist forces in southern Africa. Thus, the machinations of the racists and their mentors, which are aimed in practice at blocking and foiling the United Nations plan for Namibia, contained in the resolutions I have already mentioned, come as no surprise. This also explains why, in order to prevent the realization of the plan, artificial conditions totally extraneous to the Namibian issue, such as its linkage with the presence of Cuban forces in Angola, are being raised. This approach can only be described as blatant interference in the internal affairs of independent Angola and as a cover-up for the continued occupation of Namibia. It is no accident that the international community has flatly rejected such obviously obstructionist tactics.

164. The latest such manoeuvre of the South African racists—the establishment of a puppet administration in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia—has generated a tidal wave of indignation and protest. We have joined the

vast majority of Member States which have categorically condemned this new attempt of the colonial Power to prevent the just settlement of the Namibian question and to perpetuate its rule in Namibia. On the occasion of that attempt, the Bulgarian Telegraph Agency issued on 15 May 1985 a declaration which stated, *inter alia*:

> "The people's Republic of Bulgaria, which has rendered its whole-hearted support to the struggle of the Namibian people for the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination and national independence, and which has recognized SWAPO as their sole, legitimate representative, reaffirms hereby that the United Nations decisions, and in particular Security Council resolution 435 (1978), are the only acceptable basis upon which the independence of Namibia can and must be achieved immediately and without any preconditions."

165. In this connection, I should like to stress once again that whatever decisions South Africa may make in this respect are completely devoid of any legal force. The organs created by South Africa, under whatever pompous names, cannot be viewed as other than instruments of the policy of occupation and national domination. For this reason, they have been denounced and rejected by the international community.

166. Expressions of selfish interests and strategic designs are the attempts by well known forces to keep the United Nations out of the settlement of the Namibian problem. They have tried through unilateral actions to impose a neo-colonial solution on the peoples of the region that would ensure the economic, political and military advantages of certain imperialist States. It is abundantly clear, however, that the key to a just and lasting solution of the problem is not in the hands of mediators and envoys. It lies in the support the Member States give to the world Organization in the discharge of the responsible mission entrusted to it under a large number of resolutions and decisions adopted since 1966.

167. The policy of South Africa in Namibia is brazenly defiant of the international community. That policy is fraught with the danger of grave crises and an open military conflict that could spill over the confines of that part of the world. To the Member States it is perfectly clear that, as in the past, South Africa will continue arrogantly to disregard the explicit will of the international community. Hence my country supports the conclusions of the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April, and those of the Extraordinary Plenary Meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held at Vienna from 3 to 7 June, and calls upon the Council to impose the comprehensive mandatory sanctions envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of ensuring the immediate and unconditional implementation of the resolutions calling for the granting of real independence to Namibia.

168. The fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the formation of SWAPO are not only a serious occasion for a thoughtful analysis of the achievements made so far in strengthening world peace and decolonization; they also provide momentum to mobilize the efforts of the international community for the final elimination of the last vestiges of the shameful system of national domination. On the occasion of the anniversary of the heroic organization of the Namibian people, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate most cordially the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and once again assure him of the sincere commitment of the Bulgarian people, which itself endured centuries under the foreign yoke.

169. The unreserved support of Bulgaria for the cause of peoples fighting for social and national liberation was eloquently reaffirmed by Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, during the recent visit of the head of State of the Republic of the Congo to my country. He emphasized *inter alia* that socialist Bulgaria had invariably sided with the legitimate and just struggle of the people of Namibia, with the South African people in their struggle against racial discrimination and *apartheid*, and with the front-line States fighting to defend their independence. Bulgaria will continue to abide by this principled position in the future as well.

170. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2585th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

171. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. The manner in which you have been guiding these deliberation, the friendship that exists between the Arab nation and your country and the presence of many people whose original homeland is in the Arab world allows me to express and articulate the feelings of friendship and congratulations in a very sincere and genuine manner.

172. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the former President. During his presidency we had many moments of anxious co-operation, and we should like to express our gratitude for the wisdom with which he guided the Council's efforts.

173. At the outset I should like to read out a statement by the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, Mr. Chedli Klibi:

> "On the occasion of the Security Council meetings relating to the situation in Namibia, the League of Arab States salutes the Namibian people and reaffirms the solidarity of the Arab nation with the struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, for its freedom, dignity and independence.

"The League of Arab States seizes this opportunity to reaffirm on behalf of the Arab States its insistence on the immediate and unconditional implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) in order to ensure the realization of the rights of the Namibian people to self-determination, independence and freedom.

"The League of Arab States condemns all attempts and manoeuvres which endeavour to defy the will of the international community and the credibility of the United Nations resolutions through the imposition of the so-called internal settlement in Namibia with a view to enhancing the colonialist ambitions of the racist settlers of the Pretoria régime.

"In the meantime, the League of Arab States further condemns all attempts at introducing extraneous elements such as the linkage of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with the achievement of the independence of Namibia, which is a clear issue of decolonization entrusted to the United Nations and therefore should not be juggled in the context of super-Power considerations.

"The Council of the League of Arab States reiterated at its last session, held at Tunis from 25 to 28 March 1985, the total support of the Arab States for the struggle of the Namibian people for independence and the solidarity of the Arab nation with the heightened struggle of the oppressed majority in South Africa against the racist *apartheid* policies."

174. I wish to make a few remarks because I think that in the past few days the Council has heard to what extent South Africa is in contempt of the United Nations and particularly of the resolutions of the Security Council. We have seen how it has manoeuvred and made many attempts to circumvent the will of the international community and deny the rights of the Namibian people. This has been a pattern that, unfortunately, cannot be restrained except by the imposition of credible sanctions as prescribed in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

175. The League of Arab States and the Arab people in general have a claim to participate in the deliberations concerning Namibia because in one form or another what is taking place in South Africa pertaining to the rights of the Namibian people and self-determination is not only similar but in many ways identical to the defiance that is taking place in the Middle East on the part of Israel and the denial to the Palestinians of their right to self-determination and the withdrawal of the occupation forces from the various occupied Arab lands. The pattern is the same. The language utilized by the representatives of Pretoria and of Israel is almost identical; the excuses, the pretexts that are adduced are identical. So in many ways, when we listen here to the statements by the various States, it is as if the Council Chamber were reverberating with the echoes of what has been said in many instances in the debates pertaining to the Middle East.

176. It is no wonder that the *apartheid* régime of South Africa has close co-ordinating functional arrangements with the Government of Israel in various acts of defiance, as if those two colonial racist régime sought to reinforce each other in contempt of the decolonizing process that has encompassed the third world but has been arrested, unfortunately, in both South Africa and Namibia, and particularly also in regard to the Palestinian question.

177. For that reason, our participation is not only a question of solidarity with the people of Namibia and the leadership of SWAPO, whose struggle we salute. Not only do we condemn the racist practices but we feel that the United Nations should sustain its commitments, attempt to bring its resolutions to fruition and prove that it means what it says by the introduction of sanctions. It is high time the international community ceased to be openly defied by those two racist régimes, which act as if they were trying to set the clock back.

178. We in the League of Arab States understand in depth what the people of Namibia are going through, because we are experiencing similar oppression, violation of human rights, disenfranchisement, dispossession, forceful eviction and terrorism practised under the pretext of "law and order". The attempts to impose a so-called internal settlement are similar to Israel's attempts to impose village leagues in the West Bank and Gaza, or to what the so-called Lahd group has been doing in southern Lebanon. All these are attempts to deny the legitimacy of the international commitment and the various United Nations resolutions. It is because this pattern of behaviour has to be arrested that the Council, on the question of Namibia and on the question of the Middle East, must not be satisfied with resolutions. These are welcome but they should be made implementable. The organic relationships in the field of nuclear weapons, in the field of research and in the field of geopolitical access between South Africa and Israel warrant not only closer Arab-African co-ordination and co-operation but a United Nations investigation into the pattern of behaviour that has been introduced by those two remaining racist and colonial régimes.

179. Therefore we take this opportunity to express again our appreciation to the people of Namibia and to reiterate our solidarity with them in their struggle to achieve self-determination and in their commitment to rendering the United Nations credible and effective.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II.

[2] A/40/24 and Corr.1 and 3.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—June 1994—1,925